



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/001,302	11/01/2001	Edgar R. Zuniga-Ortiz	TI-33535	2463

23494 7590 03/13/2003

TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED  
P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999  
DALLAS, TX 75265

EXAMINER

CLARK, SHEILA V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2815	

DATE MAILED: 03/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. <b>10/001,302</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Zuniga-Ortiz et al</b>	
	Examiner <b>Sheila V.Clark</b>	Art Unit <b>2815</b>	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.

- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 24, 2003

2a)  This action is FINAL.      2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)  Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) 26-32 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a)  approved b)  disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All b)  Some\* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Art Unit: 2815

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In the claims it is unclear what is meant by “a conformal surface” in this instance. It is unclear to what “conformal” relates and to what surface said added layer is conforming. It is also unclear how said conformal surface is oriented to the chip and the pad to be adjacent to said chip. The term “without melting” as recited assumes that one knows to what aspect “melting” applies. It is unclear what aspect melting applies without other associated descriptive features.

Further in the claims, though the active surface is recited as having an integrated circuit. It is not clear that said contact pads are formed on the surface of the chip. Such claims as 7 and 10 appear to suggest that said pads would have to be distributed on the active surface is a way to also allow for a plate but claim one has not established that said pads are on the surface of the chip only in someway connected to the integrated circuit.

It is further unclear how said insulating substrate is oriented relative to the chip and the contact pads recited in claim 15. The phrase “aligned with the distribution of ...pads” fails to provide a particular orientation or location.

In claim 24 “bonding” has not antecedent.

It is suggested that all claims be evaluated for clarity for the above are just examples of the many areas that lack clarity.

Art Unit: 2815

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-25 in so far as understood are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DiGiacomo et al.

DiGiacomo et al shows a semiconductor chip 12 having contact pads 30 (see figure 4) wherein each of said pads includes a plurality of metallurgical layers including an added layer such as a gold layer 20 which forms a bond with solder layer 22. A diffusion metal layer containing titanium 17 is taught as well as layer 16 containing copper. DiGiacomo et al provides no teaching relative to the melting of said layer whereby said outer layer is only deemed to be wettable to solder which obviously fails to imply melting.

The claims such as claim 24 contain method of making characteristics ( i.e. direct welding, etc.) given no patentable weight in determining the patentability of the final device structure.

Note that a "product by process" claim is directed to the product *per se*, no matter how actually made, *In re Hirao* 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (footnote 3). See also *In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685; *In re Luck*, 177 USPQ 523; *In re Fessman*, 180 USPQ 324; *In re Avery*, 186 USPQ 161 and *In re Marosi et al*, 218 USPQ 289, all of which make it clear that it is the patentability of the final product *per se* which must be determined in "product by process" claims, and not the patentability of the process, and that, as here, an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in "product by process" claims or not.

Art Unit: 2815

Claims 1-25 are rejected.

Claims 26-32 withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in Paper No. 6.

Burns and Bachmeier are cited to show metallurgical bonds without melting.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner S.V. Clark whose telephone number is (703) 308-4924.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Lee , can be reached on (703) 308-1690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-7722 or 7724.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

March 6, 2003



SHEILA V. CLARK  
PRIMARY EXAMINER